UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/566,954	01/31/2006	Claes Gustafsson	11548-003-999	5349	
20583 JONES DAY	7590 04/07/200	8	EXAMINER		
222 EAST 41S			BORIN, MICHAEL L		
NEW YORK, NY 10017			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1631		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/07/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Symmony	10/566,954	GUSTAFSSON ET	Γ AL .			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael Borin	1631				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	J. nely filed the mailing date of this co O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x <i>parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6,8-14,16,20-23,49-52,66-68,74-100 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6,8-14,16,20-23,49-52,66-68,74-100	vn from consideration.		requirement.			
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	۲.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte				

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-6,8-14,16,20-23,49-52,66-68,74-100,121-127 are pending.

Restriction requirement

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-6,8-14,16,20-23,49-52, 74-97, 121-126, drawn to method for constructing variant set for antibody. See also, election of species requirements below.

Group II, claim 66 drawn to nucleic acids encoding antibodies from variant set.

Group III, claim 67, drawn to antibodies from the variant set.

Group IV, claim 68, drawn to cells containing nucleic acids encoding antibodies from the variant set .

Group V, claims 98,99, drawn to method of treatment of diseases caused by pathogenic organism.

Group VI, claim 100, drawn to method of treatment of diseases caused by cancer.

Group V, claim 127, drawn to computer software.

Application/Control Number: 10/566,954 Page 3

Art Unit: 1631

The inventions listed as Groups I-V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature that links Groups I to V is set of variant antibodies as in Group III. The claims directed to variant antibodies are not the contribution over the prior art because they are suggested by references teaching any sets of antibody derivatives. For example, such sets of antibody derivatives are taught in US 5,843,708 directed to chimeric antibodies. Therefore, the lack of unity is present because the linking technical feature is not a "special technical feature" as defined by PCT Rule 13.2.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention:
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Application/Control Number: 10/566,954 Page 4

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Election of species requirement

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

If Group I is elected, the following elections of species are required:

- A. Rule for step a), selected from those listed in claim 6
- B. A descriptor of first value, selected from i), ii), or iii) from claim 8
- C. A modeling step d), selected from those in claims 11,12
- D. A further step in step e), selected from those in claims 13,16,20
- E. A property measuring step, from those in claims 81,82,85,87,89,93
- F. Type of further step performed in addition to the steps of claim 1, selected from the following: addressed in claims 2,3, or addressed in claim 4, or addressed in claims 13-16,20,21, or addressed in claim 21, or addressed in claim 22, or addressed in claim 23.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species from group (A), AND group (B), AND group (C), AND group (D), AND group (E), AND group (F).

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of

search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Application/Control Number: 10/566,954 Page 7

Art Unit: 1631

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (571) 272-0713. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran can be reached on (571)272-0720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Borin, Ph.D./ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631